

VISUAL RESOURCES

This report includes generally adequate information for development of the EIR/EIS section. Much information needs to be culled for the PEIR/EIS and placed in the appendix. Certain affected environment text should be moved to the impacts section. Mitigation strategies and significant unavoidable impacts are addressed in the impacts summary but need to be expanded and discussed in the text of the section. Additional supporting discussion is needed for the assertion that the Levee System Integrity Program and Storage facilities would not have significant visual impacts. Certain tables and text discussions are not entirely consistent. Project components and mitigation measures need to be clearly described as either one or the other (part of the project or a proposed mitigation).

Conformance to Outline

Visual

Affected Environment

- TOC – does not follow outline exactly, standard Section III is missing.
- Contents – same problem

Environmental Consequences

- TOC – almost perfect, missing 5.3
- Contents – missing 5.3, but info is there. Need to add a narrative for each table.

**REVIEW COMMENTS
CALFED BAY-DELTA PROGRAM PEIS TECHNICAL REPORTS
VISUAL RESOURCES**

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

No.	Page/Para	Comment
1	Section 2.1/page 2	Text referenced a "Figure 2." Not included in report. If this refers to a previous figure, need to identify the section/chapter it is located in.
2	Section 2.1/page 2	The CVP-SWP Service Area is incorrectly defined here (also in Sections 4.5 and 5). (See for example DWR Bulletin 132 for information on SWP service areas, and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, 1992, Interim Central Valley Project Operations Criteria and Plan for CVP service area description). The service areas are quite large, since they encompass water suppliers throughout the state that receive water from the CVP and SWP. Therefore the Region of Influence (ROI) of project effects on visual resources should be carefully formulated. The ROI need not be the same as the study area. The information presented in the affected environment section should focus on the region where impacts may occur, and probably does not need to address the entire CVP-SWP service area in detail.
3	Section 3.1 (Regulatory Require.) /pages 4-5	The outline dated 1/29/97 does not identify where regulatory issues are to be addressed, so I'm not sure if Section 3.1 needs to be in Affected Environment (Volumes I or II). For other EIS/EIR documents, regulatory issues are often placed in an appendix. I recommend moving it to Volume III, as long as it is consistent with the other resource sections.
4	Section 3.2.1 (Variety Classes) /pages 5-7	Too much information for Volumes I or II. Summarize and place rest of text in Volume III. The physical relationship of US Forest service landscape provinces in California and the five study regions is unclear. The text states that the Central Valley and Sierra Foothills/Low Coastal Mountains provinces are "pertinent" to the project but it does not describe or illustrate in graphic form the relationship between the two areas.
5	Section 3.2.1/page 7	Most of this information should be considered when discussing impacts but is not necessarily relevant for the affected environment discussion. Edits suggest how parts of this text could possibly be moved to the Impact discussion, Section 3.0. Note that the incorporation/transition of this material into Impacts Section 3.0 may require some additional editing.
6	Section 4.5 (CVP and SWP Service Areas outside the Central Valley) /page 10	Text should include a brief statement(s) about historic visual conditions in this region.

REVIEW COMMENTS
CALFED BAY-DELTA PROGRAM PEIS TECHNICAL REPORTS
VISUAL RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS/ CONSEQUENCES

No.	Page/Para	Comment
1	Section 1.0/pages 2-3	Based on the EIS/EIR outline, this section should include, at minimum, a Section 6.0 (Mitigation Strategies) and Section 7.0 (Potential Significant and Unavoidable Impacts). These two items are summarized in Section 2.0 but are not included in the main body of the report. Also, per outline, aren't impact discussions supposed to compare to both existing and no action conditions?
2	Section 1.0/page 1, 3rd paragraph	Move to Volume III.
3	Section 2.1 (Summary of Potential Significant Impacts)	Suggest numbering impacts (to match up with mitigations in Section 2.2) and identifying which alternative each impact would occur under.
4	Table 2-1 /page?	Suggest highlighting "Yes" boxes so impacts for each alternative stand out (same comment for Tables 5-1, 5-3, and 5-4)
5	Section 2.2 (Summary of Mitigation Strategies /page 5	Suggest matching mitigations to numbered impacts from Section 2.1. I've edited text to try to match up a few obvious ones.
6	Section 5.2.1 (Summary of Regional Effects) /page 11	Sacramento and San Joaquin regions would have visual impacts resulting from water storage elements only (because conveyance options only proposed in the Delta).
7	Section 5.2.2.1/page 11	Explain/give reason(s) why Levee System Integrity Program and Storage Facilities would not have significant visual impacts.
8	Section 5.2.2 (Impacts of the Delta) /pages 11-12	Impacts of Alternatives 1 and 2 (Section 5.2.2.1 and 5.2.2.2) specify which alternative variation would be affected (i.e., Alternative 1C and 2A). Consistent with Table 5-1, suggest specifying impacts associated with Alternative 2B in Section 5.2.2.2 and specifying in Section 5.2.2.3 that impacts from conveyance alternatives would occur to Alternatives 3A, B, C, D, E, H, and I. Also, mention (if applicable) that impacts from Alternatives 3H and 3I are potentially significant and unavoidable, with reference to later discussion (Section 7.0)? Same comment applies to 5.2.4 and 5.2.5. I've placed edits in text but they not be entirely accurate; needs review.

10/1/97

2

C - 0 0 4 2 1 6

C-004216

REVIEW COMMENTS
CALFED BAY-DELTA PROGRAM PEIS TECHNICAL REPORTS
VISUAL RESOURCES

9	Sections 5.2.4 and 5.2.5	Text in Sections 5.4 and 5.5 is not always consistent with impact summary Tables 5-3 and 5-4 as to what is significant and mitigable and what isn't. For example, see Section 5.2.5.1, Alternative 1, Ecosystem Restoration. Text says that actions that create borrow pits in visually sensitive areas could have impacts but they could be easily mitigated through vegetation. Is this a self-mitigating impact? If not, why is it not identified as an impact in Table 5-4. Is it because the impact would last for less than five years? This needs further explanation. Same comment for Section 5.2.4.1 Alternative 1, Ecosystem Restoration, pages 13-14.
10	Section 6.0 (Mitigation Strategies)	Data gap
11	Section 7.0, Potentially Signif. and...	Data gap
12	Tables 5-6 through 5-8	Should we include tables for Impacts to San Joaquin and Sacramento River regions?
13	Section 5.2 /pages 11-16	General note: mitigation would reduce impact to a "less than significant level" (se Section 5.2.2.2, Alternative 2, Conveyance Facilities, last sentence). Check for consistency with other sections; often the term "to a not significant level" is used.
14	Section 5.2 /pages 11-16	General note: change verb tense "will" to "would" (or vice versa, as long as it is consistent).
15	Sec 4.0, p. 9 (Signif. criteria)	Are we calling these criteria or considerations (per Brownlie 8/22/97 memorandum)?

10/1/97

3

C - 0 0 4 2 1 7

C-004217